REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10 are currently amended. Reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious based on Leung in view of Jari. With regard to claim 1, the Office concedes that Leung fails to teach periodically storing the security association in non-volatile memory. However, the Office asserts that Jari discloses that feature at paragraph [0005]. Jari teaches recovery from a temporary failure of a node. As described in the abstract and paragraph [0036], and as illustrated in Figures 1 and 3, Jari is operative in response to a power failure which causes loss of the security association database in volatile memory. However, a security association need not be lost to become inaccurate or unusable.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the copy of the security association in non-volatile memory is employed when the security association in volatile memory becomes corrupted for reasons other than a power failure. Support for this new limitation is in the specification at page 5, in the last paragraph, which states:

> [a]t step 50, the process waits until the system event that results in a restore occurs. As mentioned above, the system event may be a re-boot, a power fail, a system interrupt, or a detection of corruption of the data in the SA table.

Employing the copy of the security association in non-volatile memory in the case of corruption caused by something other than power failure provides an advantage that is not taught by the cited combination. In particular, a system that is responsive only to complete loss of security

associations due to power failure would be unresponsive to corruption of a security association, which can result from various causes. Claim 1 therefore distinguishes the cited combination by reciting "in response to detection of corruption of the security association in volatile storage, where the corruption is caused by an event other than power failure, employing the copy of the security association in non-volatile storage to update the security association in volatile storage." Claims 6 and 10 have been amended to recite limitations which distinguish the cited combination for the same reasons discussed with regard to claim 1. Claims 2-5, 7-9, and 11-15 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-15 is therefore requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 28, 2007
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-162
Dd: 04/05/2007